

Square-Difference-Free Sets of Size $\Omega(n^{0.7334\dots})$

Richard Beigel *

Temple University

William Gasarch †

Univ. of MD at College Park

Abstract

A set $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ is *square-difference free* (henceforth SDF) if there do not exist $x, y \in A$, $x \neq y$, such that $|x - y|$ is a square. Let $\text{sdf}(n)$ be the size of the largest SDF subset of $\{1, \dots, n\}$. Ruzsa has shown that

$$\text{sdf}(n) = \Omega(n^{0.5(1+\log_{65} 7)}) = \Omega(n^{0.733077\dots})$$

We improve on the lower bound by showing

$$\text{sdf}(n) = \Omega(n^{0.5(1+\log_{205} 12)}) = \Omega(n^{0.7334\dots})$$

As a corollary we obtain a new lower bound on the quadratic van der Waerden numbers.

1 Introduction

Notation 1.1 $\mathbb{N}$ is the set $\{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$. If $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $n \geq 1$ then $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$.

Van der Waerden proved the following using purely combinatorial techniques ([13], see also [11] for a purely combinatorial proof with better bounds, [5] for an exposition of both of those proofs, and [4] for a proof using non-combinatorial techniques that provides the best known bounds).

*Temple University, Dept. of Computer and Information Sciences, 1805 N Broad St Fl 3, Philadelphia, PA 19122. professorb@gmail.com

†University of Maryland, Dept. of Computer Science and Institute for Advanced Computer Studies, College Park, MD 20742. gasarch@cs.umd.edu, Partially supported by NSF grant CCR-01-05413

Theorem 1.2 *For all $k, c \in \mathbf{N}$, there exists $W = W(k, c) \in \mathbf{N}$ such that, for any c -coloring $COL : [W] \rightarrow [c]$, there are $a, d \in \mathbf{N}$, $d \neq 0$, such that*

$$a, a + d, a + 2d, \dots, a + (k - 1)d \in [W]$$

$$COL(a) = COL(a + d) = COL(a + 2d) = \dots = COL(a + (k - 1)d).$$

Szemerédi [12] proved the following theorem, which implies Van der Waerden's theorem:

Theorem 1.3 *For all $k \in \mathbf{N}$, for all $0 < \alpha < 1$, for almost all n , the following holds:*

$$(\forall A \subseteq [n])(|A| \geq \alpha n \Rightarrow A \text{ has an arithmetic sequence of length } k).$$

We now look at generalizations of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3.

Note that in Theorem 1.2 we have the sequence

$$a, a + d, \dots, a + (k - 1)d.$$

Why the functions $d, 2d, \dots, (k - 1)d$? Can they be replaced by polynomials? YES (with one condition):

Theorem 1.4 *For all $c \in \mathbf{N}$, for all $p_1(x), \dots, p_k(x) \in Z[x]$ such that $(\forall i)[p_i(0) = 0]$ (that is, they all have constant term 0), there exists a natural number $W = W(p_1, \dots, p_k; c)$ such that, for all c -coloring $COL : [W] \rightarrow [c]$, there exists $a, d \in \mathbf{N}$, $d \neq 0$, such that*

$$a, a + p_1(d), a + p_2(d), \dots, a + p_k(d) \in [W]$$

$$COL(a) = COL(a + p_1(d)) = COL(a + p_2(d)) = \dots = COL(a + p_k(d)).$$

Note 1.5 Theorem 1.4 was proved for $k = 1$ by Furstenberg [3] and (independently) Sárközy [9]. Bergelson and Leibman [1] proved the general result using ergodic methods. Walters [14] proved it using purely combinatorial techniques.

Theorem 1.3 also has a polynomial analog:

Theorem 1.6 For all $0 < \alpha < 1$, for all $p_1(x), \dots, p_k(x) \in Z[x]$ such that $(\forall i)[p_i(0) = 0]$, for almost all n , the following holds:

$$(\forall A \subseteq [n])[|A| \geq \alpha n \Rightarrow (\exists a, d \in \mathbf{N})[a, a + p_1(d), a + p_2(d), \dots, a + p_k(d) \in A]]$$

Bergelson and Leibman [1] proved Theorem 1.6. This is how they obtained Theorem 1.4.

Def 1.7 A set $A \subseteq \mathbf{N}$ is *square-difference free* (henceforth SDF) if there do not exist $x, y \in A$, $x \neq y$, such that $|x - y|$ is a square.

Def 1.8 Let $\text{sdf}(n)$ be the size of the largest SDF subset of $[n]$.

Theorem 1.6 implies that, for any $0 < \alpha < 1$, for almost all n ,

$$\text{sdf}(n) \leq \alpha n.$$

The following bounds are known on $\text{sdf}(n)$.

- Sárközy [9] proved

$$\text{sdf}(n) \leq O\left(\frac{n(\log \log n)^{2/3}}{(\log n)^{1/3}}\right).$$

- Pintz, Steiger, and Szemerédi [7] proved

$$\text{sdf}(n) \leq O\left(\frac{n}{(\log n)^{c_n}}\right)$$

where $c_n \rightarrow \infty$. (See also [15] for an exposition.)

- Sárközy [10] showed that, for all $\epsilon < 0.5$, $\text{sdf}(n) \geq n^{0.5+\epsilon f(n)}$, where $f(n) = \frac{\log \log \log n}{\log \log n}$.
- Ruzsa [8] proved $\text{sdf}(n) \geq \Omega(n^{\log_{65} 7}) \geq \Omega(n^{0.733077\dots})$.

We improve on Ruzsa's result by showing

$$\text{sdf}(n) \geq \Omega(n^{\log_{205} 12}) = \Omega(n^{0.7334\dots}).$$

Our proof is similar to Ruzsa's; however, we include proofs for completeness.

2 An SDF set of size $\geq \Omega(n^{0.5})$

We present the result $\text{sdf}(n) \geq n^{0.5}$, since it is easy and, while known [10], is not online and seems hard to find. We do not need this result; however, it is very nice.

Recall Bertrand's Postulate¹ which we state as a lemma.

Lemma 2.1 *For all n there is a prime p such that $n \leq p \leq 2n$.*

Theorem 2.2

$$\text{sdf}(n) = \Omega(n^{0.5}).$$

Proof: By Bertrand's Postulate there exists a prime p such that

$$\frac{n^{0.5}}{2} \leq p \leq n^{0.5}.$$

Let

$$A = \{p, 2p, 3p, \dots, p^2\}.$$

Clearly, $|A| = p \geq \Omega(\sqrt{n})$. We show that A is SDF.

Let ip and jp be two elements of A . Note that

$$jp - ip = (j - i)p.$$

We can assume that $i < j$, so

$$1 \leq i < j \leq p.$$

Thus we have $j - i < p$. Hence $(j - i)p$ has only one factor of p , so $jp - ip$ cannot be a square. ■

¹Bertrand's Postulate was actually proven by Chebyshev's. Bertrand conjectured that, for all $n > 3$, there is a prime between n and $2n - 2$. Bertrand proved it for all $n < 3 \times 10^6$. Cheshire proved it completely in 1850. It is usually stated as we do below. A proof due to Erdős can be found either in [6] or on Wikipedia.

3 An SDF set of size $\geq \Omega(n^{0.7334\dots})$

To obtain large SDF sets, we will first work with SDF sets with respect to various moduli.

Convention 3.1 Throughout this section when we deal with mod m we will use the set $[m] = \{1, \dots, m\}$ rather than the more traditional $\{0, \dots, m-1\}$. In calculations we may use 0 instead of m for clarity. For example, if we have that $b_1 \equiv b_2 \pmod{m}$ then we will feel free to write $b_1 - b_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{m}$.

Def 3.2 Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. A set $A \subseteq [n]$ is *square-difference free mod n* (henceforth $\text{SDFMOD}(n)$) if there do not exist $x, y \in A$, $x \neq y$, such that $x - y$ is a square mod n .

Def 3.3 Let $\text{sdfmod}(n)$ be the size of the largest $\text{SDFMOD}(n)$ set.

Note that $\text{sdfmod}(n) \leq \text{sdf}(n)$. We will obtain lower bounds for $\text{sdf}(n)$ by obtaining lower bounds for $\text{sdfmod}(n)$. The next lemma shows how to construct such sets.

Lemma 3.4 Assume m is squarefree, $k \geq 1$, and B, X, S, Y are sets such that the following hold:

1. S is an $\text{SDFMOD}(m)$ subset of $[m]$.
2. X is an $\text{SDFMOD}(m^{2k-2})$ subset of $[m^{2k-2}]$.
3. $B = \{mz + b \mid z \in \{0, \dots, m-1\} \wedge b \in S\}$. Note that $B \subseteq [m^2]$ and $|B| = m|S|$.
4. $Y = \{m^2x + s \pmod{m^{2k}} \mid x \in X \wedge s \in B\}$. Since Y is defined $\pmod{m^{2k}}$, when we use Convention 3.1, we have $Y \subseteq [m^{2k}]$. Note that $|Y| = |X||B| = m|S||X|$.

Then Y is an $\text{SDFMOD}(m^{2k})$ subset of $[m^{2k}]$.

Proof: Suppose, by way of contradiction, that there exist two elements of Y , y_1 and y_2 , whose difference is a square mod m^{2k} . By the definition of Y , we can write those elements as

- $y_1 = m^2x_1 + s_1$, where $x_1 \in X$ and $s_1 \in B$.
- $y_2 = m^2x_2 + s_2$, where $x_2 \in X$ and $s_2 \in B$.

Since $s_1, s_2 \in B$,

- $s_1 = mz_1 + b_1$, where $z_1 \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$ and $b_1 \in S$.
- $s_2 = mz_2 + b_2$, where $z_2 \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$ and $b_2 \in S$.

Hence

- $y_1 = m^2x_1 + mz_1 + b_1$, where $x_1 \in X$, $z_1 \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$, and $b_1 \in S$.
- $y_2 = m^2x_2 + mz_2 + b_2$, where $x_2 \in X$, $z_2 \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$, and $b_2 \in S$.

Since $y_1 - y_2$ is a square mod m^{2k} there exists a, L such that

$$y_1 - y_2 = a^2 + Lm^{2k}$$

$$m^2(x_1 - x_2) + m(z_1 - z_2) + (b_1 - b_2) = a^2 + Lm^{2k}.$$

Reducing this equation mod m , we obtain

$$b_1 - b_2 \equiv a^2 \pmod{m}.$$

By the definition of S , $b_1 = b_2$, so we have

$$a^2 \equiv 0 \pmod{m}.$$

Since m divides a^2 , and m is squarefree, m divides a . Hence $a = cm$, so $a^2 = c^2m^2$. Thus we have

$$m^2(x_1 - x_2) + m(z_1 - z_2) = c^2m^2 + Lm^{2k}.$$

Reducing this equation mod m^2 , and using the fact that $k \geq 1$, we obtain

$$m(z_1 - z_2) \equiv 0 \pmod{m^2}.$$

Since $0 \leq z_1, z_2 \leq m-1$, we have $m|z_1 - z_2| < m^2$, hence $z_1 = z_2$.

Since $b_1 = b_2$ and $z_1 = z_2$, we now have

$$m^2(x_1 - x_2) = c^2m^2 + Lm^{2k}$$

Dividing by m^2 , we obtain

$$(x_1 - x_2) = c^2 + Lm^{2k-2}.$$

Recall that $x_1, x_2 \in X$. By the condition on X , there do not exist two elements of X whose difference is a square mod m^{2k-2} . Since the last equation states that the difference of two elements of X is a square mod m^{2k-2} , this is a contradiction. ■

Lemma 3.5 *For all $k \geq 1$, $\text{sdfmod}(m^{2k}) \geq m \cdot \text{sdfmod}(m) \cdot \text{sdfmod}(m^{2k-2})$.*

Proof: Let S be an SDFMOD(m) set of size $\text{sdfmod}(m)$ and let X be an SDFMOD(m^{2k-2}) set of size $\text{sdfmod}(m^{2k-2})$. By Lemma 3.4 there exists Y , an SDFMOD(m^{2k}) set of size $m \cdot \text{sdfmod}(m) \cdot \text{sdfmod}(m^{2k-2})$. Hence

$$\text{sdfmod}(m^{2k}) \geq m \cdot \text{sdfmod}(m) \cdot \text{sdfmod}(m^{2k-2}).$$

■

Lemma 3.6 *Assume that there exists a squarefree m and a set $S \subseteq [m]$ such that S is SDFMOD(m). Then $\text{sdf}(n) \geq \Omega(n^{0.5(1+\log_m |S|)})$. (The constant implicit in the Ω depends on m .)*

Proof: By the premise, $\text{sdfmod}(m) \geq |S|$. By Lemma 3.5

$$(\forall k \geq 1)[\text{sdfmod}(m^{2k}) \geq m|S|\text{sdfmod}(m^{2k-2})].$$

Hence

$$\text{sdfmod}(m^{2k}) \geq (m|S|)^k \text{sdfmod}(1) = (m|S|)^k$$

Let $n = m^{2k}$, so $k = \log_m \sqrt{n}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} (m|S|)^k &= m^k (|S|)^k \\ &= m^k (|S|)^{\log_m \sqrt{n}} \\ &= n^{0.5} |S|^{\log_m \sqrt{n}} \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$|S|^{\log_m \sqrt{n}} = (\sqrt{n})^{\log_m |S|} = n^{0.5 \log_m |S|}.$$

Hence, for $n = m^{2k}$,

$$\text{sdfmod}(m^{2k}) \geq (m|S|)^k = n^{0.5} n^{0.5 \log_m |S|} = n^{0.5(1+\log_m |S|)}.$$

Thus we have

$$\text{sdfmod}(n) \geq \Omega(n^{0.5(1+\log_m |S|)}).$$

■

Theorem 3.7 $\text{sdf}(n) \geq \Omega(n^{\log_{205} 12}) \geq \Omega(n^{0.7334\dots})$.

Proof: Let $m = 205$ and $S = \{0, 2, 8, 14, 77, 79, 85, 96, 103, 109, 111, 181\}$. Clearly, m is square free. An easy calculation shows that there are no two elements of S whose difference is a square mod m . Note that $\log_m |S| = \log_{205} 12 > 0.4668$. Hence, by Lemma 3.6,

$$\text{sdf}(n) \geq \Omega(n^{0.5(1+\log_m |S|)}) \geq \Omega(n^{0.5(1+0.4668)}) \geq \Omega(n^{0.7334\dots}).$$

■

Note 3.8 Ruzsa used $m = 65$ and $S = 7$ to obtain his results.

4 Square-Difference-Free Colorings

The following is an easy corollary of Theorem 1.4.

Theorem 4.1 *There exists a function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds:*

If $[f(c)]$ is c -colored, there will be $x < y$ such that x and y are the same color and $y - x$ is a square.

The proof of Theorem 1.4 [14] gives an enormous upper bound on f . We can use our results to provide a lower bound. The idea is as follows: Take a square-difference-free set, and translate it c times to obtain a c -coloring.

Def 4.2 Let $A \subseteq [n]$. B is a *translate of A relative to n* if there exists t such that

$$B = \{x + t : x \in A\} \cap [n].$$

We will omit the “relative to n ” when n is clear from context.

The following lemma is Lemma 4.4 from [2]; however, it can also be viewed as a special case of the Symmetric Hypergraph Lemma [5].

Lemma 4.3 *Let $A \subseteq [n]$. There exist $c \leq O(\frac{n \log n}{|A|})$ and sets $A_1, \dots, A_c$ that are translates of A such that $[n] = A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_c$. (Note that the lemma holds for any set A ; however, we will apply it when A is SDF.)*

Lemma 4.4 *Let c, n be such that $c \leq O(\frac{n \log n}{\text{sdf}(n)})$, and let f be the function from Theorem 4.1. Then $f(c) \geq n$.*

Proof: Let $A \subseteq [n]$ be an SDF set of size $\text{sdf}(n)$. By Lemma 4.3, there exist $c \leq O(\frac{n \log n}{\text{sdf}(n)})$ translates of A such that the union of the translates covers all of $[n]$. Call the translates $A_1, \dots, A_c$. Let χ be the c -coloring of $[n]$ that maps a number x to the least i such that $x \in A_i$. For $1 \leq i \leq c$ let C_i be the set of numbers that are colored i . Since each C_i is an SDF, this coloring has no $x, y \in [n]$, $x \neq y$, such that $\chi(x) = \chi(y)$ and $|x - y|$ is a square. Hence $f(c) \geq n$. ■

Theorem 4.5 $f(c) \geq \Omega(c^{3.75})$.

Proof: Fix c . We want to find an n as small as possible such that

$$c \leq O\left(\frac{n \log n}{\text{sdf}(n)}\right).$$

Since $\text{sdf}(n) \geq \Omega(n^{0.7334\dots})$

$$\left(\frac{n \log n}{n^{0.7334\dots}}\right) \leq O(n^{0.2666}).$$

Hence it will suffice to find an n as small as possible such that

$$c \leq O(n^{0.2666}).$$

We can take

$$n \geq \Omega(c^{1/0.2666}) \geq \Omega(c^{3.75}).$$

Hence $f(c) \geq \Omega(c^{3.75})$.
■

5 Open Problem

Combining the upper bound of [7] with our lower bound we have:

$$\Omega(n^{0.7334\dots}) \leq \text{sdf}(n) \leq O\left(\frac{n}{\log^{c_n} n}\right)$$

where $c_n \rightarrow \infty$.

The open problem is to close this gap. One way to raise the lower bounds is to find values of m and $|S|$ that satisfy the premise of Lemma 3.6 with a larger value of $\log_m |S|$ than we obtained.

6 Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Georgia Martin and Edward Gan for proofreading and commentary. We would like to thank Boris Bukh, Ben Green, and Nikos Frantzikinakis for pointing us to the papers [8] and [7].

References

- [1] V. Bergelson and A. Leibman. Polynomial extensions of van der Waerden’s and Szemerédi’s theorems. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, pages 725–753, 1996. <http://www.math.ohio-state.edu/~vitaly/>.
- [2] A. Chandra, M. Furst, and R. Lipton. Multiparty protocols. In *Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing*, Boston MA, pages 94–99, 1983. <http://portal.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=808737>.
- [3] H. Furstenberg. Ergodic behavior of diagonal measures and a theorem of Szemerédi’s on arithmetic progressions. *Journal of the Annals of Mathematics*, 31:204–256, 1977.
- [4] W. Gowers. A new proof of Szemerédi’s theorem. *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, 11:465–588, 2001. Available at <http://www.dpmms.cam.ac.uk/~wtg10/papers/html>.
- [5] R. Graham, A. Rothschild, and J. Spencer. *Ramsey Theory*. Wiley, 1990.

- [6] G. Hardy and E. Wright. *An introduction to the theory of numbers*. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1979. Fifth Edition. The first edition was in 1938.
- [7] J. Pintz, W. Steiger, and E. Szemerédi. On sets of natural numbers whose difference set contains no squares. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 37:219–231, 1988.
- [8] I. Ruzsa. Difference sets without squares. *Periodica Mathematica Hungarica*, pages 205–209, 1984.
- [9] A. Sárközy. On difference sets of sequences of integers I. *Acta Math. Sci. Hung.*, 31:125–149, 1977.
- [10] A. Sárközy. On difference sets of sequences of integers II. *Annales Universitatis Scientiarum Budapestinensis De Reolando Eotvos Nominatete*, 21, 1978.
- [11] S. Shelah. Primitive recursive bounds for van der Waerden numbers. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, pages 683–697, 1988. <http://www.jstor.org/view/08940347/di963031/96p0024f/0>.
- [12] E. Szemerédi. On sets of integers containing no k elements in arithmetic progression. *Acta Arith.*, 27:299–345, 1986.
- [13] B. van der Waerden. Beweis einer Baudetschen Vermutung. *Nieuw Arch. Wisk.*, 15:212–216, 1927.
- [14] M. Walters. Combinatorial proofs of the polynomial van der Waerden theorem and the polynomial Hales-Jewett theorem. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 61:1–12, 2000. <http://jlms.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/reprint/61/1/1>.
- [15] J. Wolf. Sets whose differences set is square-free, 2008. Unpublished manuscript.